

distribution, their results are similar to those of OPP.

OPP has recently started to apply the methodology described herein to estimate acute dietary exposure to pesticide residues in food. OPP is asking the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel and the public to answer specific questions regarding the methodology.

IV. Questions/Issues for Comment

While comments are invited on any aspect of the draft policy paper, EPA is particularly interested in comments on the following questions and issues.

1. Measurements of many natural processes may be described by typical statistical distributions, e.g., normal, lognormal, etc. In previous data-fit studies, data on concentration of residues on fruits and vegetables have been fitted to a lognormal distribution. The lognormality of residues has been established as a fundamental assumption in the decomposition procedure. Please comment on the assumption of lognormality.

2. The application of OPP's decomposition methodology calls for at least 30 "detects." This is done to assure that there is enough representation in the sample and that the extrapolation will cover the width of the distribution of single servings. Although 30 detects is a practical rule for the application of the procedure, please comment on the consideration of other numbers as a practical rule of application.

3. The standard deviation within a composite cannot be greater than the standard deviation of the population of individual residues. Are there any circumstances when this statement is not true? If so, what are these circumstances?

4. OPP acknowledges that the collection of composite samples in the PDP protocol is not purely random; therefore, the decomposition procedure will produce an overestimation of the standard deviation of the lognormal distributions of residues on fruits and vegetables. Moreover, the overestimation of the standard deviation is accentuated to the degree that the collection of composite samples departs from pure randomness. The consequence of overestimating the standard deviation is that the high end of the estimates of residues in single serving size samples may exceed what occurs in reality. What criteria (if any) should be used to establish an upper-bound on the amount of residue projected in a single serving size sample to address the potential for overestimation of the standard deviation? How should the distribution of residues in single servings samples be

interpreted when the PDP protocol does not assure that individual single servings samples are not randomly collected?

5. OPP's methodology is sensitive to the number (N) of single units/servings of a commodity estimated to be in a composite sample. Please comment on how to estimate that number for different commodities. Consider how to handle fruits for which a single serving is typically only a part of a unit of a commodity (e.g., a melon) or many different units (e.g., grapes) even though the single serving is smaller than the typical composite sample.

6. When there is considerable uncertainty about the number (N) of single units/servings of a commodity in a composite sample, should OPP generate several distributions of residues in single servings that encompass the possible range of values for N? Should these distributions in turn be used in DEEM to represent uncertainty in dietary exposure estimates?

V. Policies Not Rules

The draft policy document discussed in this notice is intended to provide guidance to EPA personnel and decision-makers, and to the public. As a guidance document and not a rule, the policy in this guidance is not binding on either EPA or any outside parties. Although this guidance provides a starting point for EPA risk assessments, EPA will depart from its policy where the facts or circumstances warrant. In such cases, EPA will explain why a different course was taken. Similarly, outside parties remain free to assert that a policy is not appropriate for a specific pesticide or that the circumstances surrounding a specific risk assessment demonstrate that a policy should be abandoned.

EPA has stated in this notice that it will make available revised guidance after consideration of public comment. Public comment is not being solicited for the purpose of converting any policy document into a binding rule. EPA will not be codifying this policy in the Code of Federal Regulations. EPA is soliciting public comment so that it can make fully informed decisions regarding the content of each guidance document.

The "revised" guidance will not be unalterable. Once a "revised" guidance document is issued, EPA will continue to treat it as guidance, not a rule. Accordingly, on a case-by-case basis EPA will decide whether it is appropriate to depart from the guidance or to modify the overall approach in the guidance. In the course of inviting comment on each guidance document,

EPA would welcome comments that specifically address how a guidance document can be structured so that it provides meaningful guidance without imposing binding requirements.

VI. Contents of Docket

Documents that are referenced in this notice will be inserted in the docket under the docket control number "OPP-00600." In addition, the documents referenced in the framework notice, which published in the **Federal Register** on October 29, 1998 (63 FR 58038), have also been inserted in the docket under docket control number OPP-00557.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Administrative practice and procedure, Agricultural commodities, pesticides and pests.

Dated: May 12, 1999.

Susan H. Wayland,
*Acting Assistant Administrator for
Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.*

[FR Doc. 99-13034 Filed 5-25-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting; Announcing an Open Meeting of the Board

TIME AND DATE: 10:00 a.m., May 28, 1999.

PLACE: Board Room, Second Floor, Federal Housing Finance Board, 1777 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

STATUS: The entire meeting will be open to the public.

Matters To Be Considered During Portions Open to the Public

- Discussion: Financial Management and Mission Achievement
- Resolution Waiving Leverage Limits for Y2K
- Final Rule: Establishment of Procedures that govern applications for Approvals or Waivers, Request for No-Action Letters or Regulatory Interpretations, and Petitions for case-by-case Determination or Review of Disputed Supervisory Determinations.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Elaine L. Baker, Secretary to the Board,
(202) 408-2837.

William W. Ginsberg,
Managing Director.

[FR Doc. 99-13482 Filed 5-24-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6725-01-P